

REMARKS

Claims 4-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 4-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,862,447 issued to Solondz ("Solondz") in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,353,607 issued to Valentine et al. ("Valentine et al."), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0029534 A1 to Odenwalder ("Odenwalder"). Furthermore, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solondz in view of Odenwalder, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,133,081 issued to Mayo ("Mayo").

Reconsideration of the application based on the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to claims 4-11

Claims 4-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,862,447 issued to Solondz ("Solondz") in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,353,607 issued to Valentine et al. ("Valentine et al."), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0029534 A1 to Odenwalder ("Odenwalder").

Solondz describes a method of making downlink operational measurements in which base station BS1, BS2, etc. of a respective cell Cell 1, Cell 2, etc. sends a measurement request to a main control unit MCU 202 of a mobile switching center 200, which in turn routes the measurement request to other base station(s) for instructing mobile terminals to make operational measurements. See col. 2, lines 1-12, and col. 4, lines 1-23, and Fig. 1.

Valentine et al. describes a transmission of data between MSCs 12 and 14 of a cellular communications network during MSC handover, the transmission being performed using a network utilizing Internet protocol. See col. 3, lines 22-39.

Odenwalder describes a method and system for performing a handoff in a wireless communication system in which a mobile station 102 transmits reverse link traffic data to a base station 106a. See page 2, paragraph [0027].

Independent claims 4 and 8 of the present application recite “transmitting the corresponding parameter values to a broadcast transmitter, the transmitting being performed automatically via an Internet,” the parameter values corresponding to “quality data of a received high frequency digital signal.” It is respectfully submitted that a combination of Solondz, Odenwalder and Valentine et al., to the extent proper, would not provide transmitting of such corresponding parameter values to a broadcast transmitter via an Internet, as recited in claims 4 and 8. As noted by the Examiner, Solondz does not clearly teach transmission of (any) data to a broadcast transmitter automatically via an Internet. See Office Action mailed January 26, 2006 at page 3, lines 4-6. Indeed, Solondz merely transfers operational measurements between mobile terminals and base stations wirelessly. See Solondz, col. 4, lines 40-45. Nor does Valentine et al. teach transmission automatically over an Internet of parameter values corresponding to quality data of a received high frequency digital signal, as recited in claims 4 and 8. In contrast, Valentine et al. merely teaches transmission, over a network using Internet protocol, of data between two MSCs of a cellular network during MSC handover. See Valentine et al., col. 3, lines 22-39. Valentine has nothing to do with parameter

values corresponding to quality data of a received high frequency digital signal, as recited in claims 4 and 8. Thus a combination of Solondz and Valentine et al. would not provide transmission automatically over an Internet of parameter values corresponding to quality data of a received high frequency digital signal, as recited in claims 4 and 8. Regarding Odenwalder, this reference merely wirelessly transmits reverse link traffic data from a mobile station 102 to a base station 106a. See page 2, paragraph [0027], and Fig. 2. Thus a combination of Solondz, Valentine et al. and Odenwalder would also not provide transmission automatically over an Internet of parameter values corresponding to quality data of a received high frequency digital signal, as recited in claims 4 and 8.

Because a combination of Solondz, Valentine et al and Odenwalder would be missing at least the above-recited features of independent claims 4 and 8, it is respectfully submitted that such a combination could not render claims 4 and 8, or their respective dependent claims, unpatentable.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 8, as well as their respective dependent claims 5-7 and 9-11, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Solondz in view of Valentine et al. and further in view of Odenwalder is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solondz in view of Odenwalder, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,133,081 issued to Mayo ("Mayo").

Mayo describes a remotely controllable message broadcast system having a remote message

low power AM radio transmitter. See col. 20, lines 24-26.

Independent claim 12 of the present application recites “providing a backward channel to an AM transmitter for digital signals received in a target area.” It is respectfully submitted that a combination of Solondz, Odenwalder and Mayo, if proper (and it is respectfully submitted that such combination would not be proper) would not provide a backward channel to an AM transmitter, as recited in claim 12. In fact, such a combination would not work. Solondz merely wirelessly transmits reverse link traffic from a mobile station to a base station BS1, BS2, etc., in a respective cell Cell 1, Cell 2, etc. See Solondz, col. 4, lines 42-45. Likewise, Odenwalder merely wirelessly transmits reverse link traffic data from a mobile station 102 to a base station 106a. See Odenwalder, page 2, paragraph 0027, and Fig. 2. Base station 106a is part of a cellular subscriber communications system 100, the term “base station” being used in Odenwalder generally interchangeably with “cell.” See page 2, paragraphs [0027] and [0022], and Fig. 1. The lower power AM radio transmitter of Mayo would not work in the cellular systems of Solondz or Odenwalder to receive reverse link traffic data from a mobile station 102, as an AM transmitter cannot function as a cellular system base station, or “cell.” Moreover, there would have been no motivation to try to combine Solondz and Odenwalder with Mayo in such a way, since attempting to transmit reverse link traffic data from a mobile station to an AM radio transmitter would entail additional hardware beyond the base station, the base station being already capable of receiving reverse link traffic data from a mobile station.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Solondz in view of Odenwalder, and further in view of Mayo, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
DARBY & DARBY, P.C.

Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By /ERS/
Erik R. Swanson
Registration No.: 40,833
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicants